## Fiscal Estimate - 2009 Session

Original Updated	Corrected Supplemental								
LRB Number <b>09-0140/1</b>	Introduction Number AB-0087								
Description Disposal of ash resulting from the burning of a structure									
Fiscal Effect									
Appropriations Reversible Appropriations Reversible Appropriations Reversible Appropriations Reversible Appropriations Reversible Appropriations	lncrease Costs - May be possilease Existing to absorb within agency's budgenues	jet							
□ No Local Government Costs       5. Types of Local         □ Indeterminate       5. Types of Local         1. □ Increase Costs       3. □ Increase Revenue       □ Towns       □ Village       □ Cities         □ Permissive □ Mandatory       □ Decrease Revenue       □ Counties       □ Others         □ Permissive □ Mandatory       □ Permissive □ Mandatory       □ Districts       □ Districts									
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations  GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS									
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature Date								
DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794	Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794 3/4/2009								

## Fiscal Estimate Narratives DNR 3/4/2009

LRB Number	09-0140/1	Introduction Number	AB-0087	Estimate Type	Original		
Description							
Disposal of ash resulting from the burning of a structure							

## **Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate**

Bill Summary: The bill would prohibit the Department from requiring that ash resulting from the burning of a structure for practice or instruction of fire fighters, or the testing of fire fighting equipment be disposed of in a landfill licensed under s. 289.31 Stats.

Assumptions: The Department's Air Management Program estimates that approximately 200 test burns occur in Wisconsin annually. Based on consultations with landfill owners, the Department estimates that each test burn produces approximately 20 tons of ash. A further estimate is that in 80% of cases, test burn ash would not be voluntarily disposed of in licensed landfills.

State Fiscal Estimate: The current Wisconsin tipping fees are approximately \$5.90 per ton. Since the majority of tonnage tipping fees are revenue sources for the Environmental Fund and the Recycling and Renewable Energy Fund, it is assumed that the prohibition of ash may result in decreased revenue to these funds. It is assumed that: 200 test burns X 80% X 20 tons of ash X \$5.90 = \$18,900 in lost revenue. It is not possible to determine the associated reduced state operations expenditures, so this fiscal effect is indeterminate.

Local Fiscal Estimate: Since the Environmental Fund and the Recycling Fund also fund local aids, it is assumed the prohibition of ash may result in a decrease in these local aids expenditures. It is not possible to determine the reduced local aids, so this fiscal effect is indeterminate.

Individual Fiscal Estimate: The property owner is typically responsible for the cost of landfill ash disposal following a test burn. In the short run, savings would accrue to the property owner. Avoided costs to properly dispose of the ash, including transportation costs and tipping fees, could run \$30 to \$50 per ton. Annual Avoided Costs to Property Owners of Disposing of Test Burn Ash in Licensed Landfills: 200 test burns per year X 80% X 20 tons of ash per test burn X \$40 per ton average = \$130,000 per year.

Avoided costs from not being required to landfill test burn ash could be outpaced by costs associated with private well replacements, groundwater cleanup, or reduced property values. These costs could accrue to property owners or governmental entities but are also assumed to be indeterminate.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

## Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2009 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

×	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supplemental		
LRE	3 Number	09-0140	/1	Intro	duction Nu	mber	AB-0087		
	Description Disposal of ash resulting from the burning of a structure								
	I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in								
	annualized fiscal effect):								
None	9								
II. Aı	nualized Cos	its:					act on funds from:		
					Increased Cos	its	Decreased Costs		
A. S	tate Costs by	Category							
St	ate Operations	- Salaries an	d Fringes			\$	\$		
<b>┷</b>	TE Position Ch								
St	ate Operations	- Other Cost	S						
	cal Assistance								
Ai	ds to Individua								
	TOTAL State					\$	\$		
	tate Costs by	Source of Fu	unds						
G	PR								
	D								
$\vdash$	RO/PRS								
	EG/SEG-S								
III. S reve	tate Revenue nues (e.g., tax	s - Complete x increase, d	this only whecrease in lic	en proposa ense fee, e	al will increase ets.)	e or decre	ase state		
					Increased R	ev	Decreased Rev		
G	PR Taxes					\$	\$		
G	PR Earned								
F	ED								
P	RO/PRS								
S	EG/SEG-S						-18,900		
	TOTAL State					\$	\$-18,900		
			NET ANNUA	LIZED FISC	AL IMPACT				
					Sta		Local		
NET	CHANGE IN	COSTS				\$	\$		
NET	CHANGE IN I	REVENUE			\$-18,9	00	\$		
A ==	nov/Propared	Rv	1	Authorized	Signature		Date		
Age	ingonoy/i repaired by								
DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794 Joe					k (608) 266-27	94	3/4/2009		